

REMARKS

Claims 16-22, 27 and 28 are now pending in the application. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks contained herein.

SPECIFICATION

The office action alleges that the title of the invention is not descriptive. Applicant respectfully requests clarification of this finding. On June 1, 2006, Applicant replaced the original title with the following: LIQUID CRYSTAL ARRANGEMENT METHOD, AND LIQUID CRYSTAL ARRANGEMENT DEVICE. Applicant submits that this new title is descriptive. If the Examiner believes this new title is not descriptive, then a confirmation of such is respectfully requested and a recommended title may expedite prosecution.

REJECTION UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 16-22 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,867,840) in view of Yamamoto et al. (Japanese Pat. Document No. 09-138410). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Notwithstanding, claims 16 and 20 are amended. The amendments to claims 16 and 20 are based on the description in the original specification of the present application and do not introduce new matter. For example, support can be found on page 10, lines 11 to 13 wherein the description reads "Moreover, film forming device 10 comprises an electronic balance (not shown) as a weight measurement device provided on base 112, capping unit 25, and cleaning unit 24". Further support can be found in

the description on page 12, lines 14 to 20 wherein the description reads "In Fig. 1, an electronic balance (not shown) receives, for example, 5000 liquid droplets from the nozzles of liquid discharge head 21 to measure and manage the weight of individual droplets discharged from the nozzles of liquid discharge head 21. By dividing the weight of these 5000 liquid droplets by the number 5000, the electronic balance is able to accurately measure the weight of a single liquid droplet. The amount of liquid droplets discharged from liquid discharge head 21 can then be optimally controlled based on the measured weight of a single liquid droplet".

As amended, Claim 16 calls for a liquid crystal arrangement method including "measuring a weight of the single liquid droplet for obtaining said diameter". With this feature, the claimed liquid crystal arrangement method can obtain an advantageous effect of optimally controlling the amount of each liquid droplet which is necessary for obtaining a desired diameter of each liquid droplet after the impact (refer to "The amount of liquid droplets discharged from liquid discharge head 21 can then be optimally controlled based on the measured weight of a single liquid droplet" on page 12, lines 18-20, in the original specification of the present application).

Similarly, amended Claim 20 calls for a liquid crystal arrangement device including "a weight measurement device which measures a weight of the single liquid droplet". With this feature, the liquid crystal arrangement device can obtain the same advantageous effect as that of the liquid crystal arrangement method according to currently amended claim 16.

In contrast, neither Hsieh et al. nor Yamamoto et al. discloses or suggests the above-mentioned features of claims 16 and 20. Accordingly, claims 16 and 20 of the

present application should be allowable since each of them includes the above-mentioned feature which is not disclosed nor suggested in the citations and results in the above-mentioned advantageous effect. In addition, claims 17 to 19, 21 and 22 should also be allowable due to their dependency on allowable claim 16 or 20.

Claims 27-28 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Hsieh et al. (U.S. Pat. No. 6,867,840) in view of Yamamoto et al. (Japanese Pat. Document No. 09-138410), and further in view of Yamamoto et al. (U.S. Pat. Pub. No. 2004/0201818). This rejection is respectfully traversed.

None of Hsieh et al., Yamamoto et al., nor Yamamoto '818 discloses or suggests the above-mentioned features of claims 16 and 20. Accordingly, claims 27-28 should be allowable due to their dependency on allowable claim 16 or 20.

CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the stated grounds of rejection have been properly traversed, accommodated, or rendered moot. Applicant therefore respectfully requests that the Examiner reconsider and withdraw all presently outstanding rejections. It is believed that a full and complete response has been made to the outstanding Office Action and the present application is in condition for allowance. Thus, prompt and favorable consideration of this amendment is respectfully requested.

If the Examiner believes that personal communication will expedite prosecution of this application, the Examiner is invited to telephone the undersigned at (248) 641-1600.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: Nov. 8, 2006

By:


G. Gregory Schivley
Reg. No. 27,382
Bryant E. Wade
Reg. No. 40,344

HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.
P.O. Box 828
Bloomfield Hills, Michigan 48303
(248) 641-1600

[GGS/BEW/pvd]